

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 21-23 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a publication titled, "LASS: Putting the telephone customer in charge", by C. Brant Hirschman, Grant E. Swinehart, and Marie L. Todd, dated May 1985 (hereinafter "Hirschman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,957 to McConnell (hereinafter "McConnell"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 defines a method for blocking future calls from the caller to the callee. As amended, claim 1 now recites:

connecting a call from the caller to the callee;
receiving a first instruction from the callee to access a service to block future calls from the caller to the callee;
providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction;
receiving a second instruction from the callee;
identifying a first telephone number associated with the caller;
storing the first telephone number associated with the caller in a caller block table in a service data point (SDP); and
preventing, via a service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the first telephone number from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee.

The combination of Hirschman and McConnell fails to teach or suggest this method. Hirschman is silent as to the concept of "providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction" and "receiving a second instruction from the callee." Rather, Hirschman states, "[a]fter the customer hangs up, the feature can be activated by dialing *60 or 1160. LASS obtains the directory number from the line history memory, and stores it in the screen list memory. At the completion of the process, the customer hears a confirmation tone." Hirschman, pg 14, cols. 2-3. Furthermore, Hirschman states, "[a]ll these features can be deactivated in the same way by dialing the feature deactivation code." Hirschman, pg 14, col. 3. If anything, Hirschman teaches away from the claimed method as Hirschman discloses a customer dialing an activation code after hanging up the phone following reception of a nuisance phone call. The use of a customer dialing an activation code after hanging up the phone following reception of a nuisance phone call is far different than the method of claim 1.

McConnell fails to provide the missing teaching in Hirschman. The Office cites McConnell as providing a conventional implementation of an advanced intelligent network (AIN). Specifically, the Office notes:

McConnel's [sic] system provides a centralized database within the telephonic switching operations through multiple end offices. Local and toll offices of the public telephone network detect a call processing event identified as an AIN 'trigger'. An office that detects a trigger, however, will suspend call processing, compile a call data message and forward that message via a common channel interoffice signaling link to a Service Control Point (SCP) that includes the database [sic]. The SCP can instruct the central office to obtain and forward

additional information. The SCP accesses its stored data tables to translate the received message data into a call control message to the office of the network that then use the call control message to complete the particular call (McConnell, Fig. 1, items 40, 11, 15, 17). Office Action of 10/22/2004, page 3, second paragraph.

McConnell does not teach or suggest blocking calls or preventing one or more phone calls from the first telephone number from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee. Moreover, McConnell does not describe "providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction" and "receiving a second instruction from the callee" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the combination of Hirschman and McConnell fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1. For this reason alone, the §103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define methods not taught or suggested by the Hirschman/McConnell combination.

Claim 13 is amended similarly to claim 1 and hence benefits from the argument made above. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 13.

Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 13, define telecommunications systems not taught or suggested by the Hirschman/McConnell combination.

New claims 21-23 are added for consideration. Applicant believes that these claims are directed toward subject matter that is not taught in the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 21-23 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/22/05

By: 

Lewis C. Lee
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256 ext. 211